

REMARKS

[0001] In the Office Action, claims 1-28 are pending in the case. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 14-19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of USPN 6,538,762 to Terashima et al. (hereinafter Terashima) and in further view of USPN 6,507,347 to van de Ven. (hereinafter van de Ven). The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima in view of van de Ven and in further view of USPN 6,049,390 to Notredame et al. (hereinafter Notredame). The Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima in view of van de Ven and in further view of USPN 6,310,563 to Har et al. (hereinafter Har). The examiner rejected claims 10-13 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Terashima in view of van de Ven and in further view of Har and Notredame.

CLAIMS REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

[0002] Claims 1-4, 14-19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima in view of van de Ven. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

[0003] van de Ven discloses an invention for digital image compression for digital display screens. van de Ven does not teach or suggest applying the invention to a printer. Furthermore, Terashima does not teach or suggest transmitting both compressed and non-compressed data types over one transmission path.

[0004] To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings to arrive at the claimed

invention. “The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination ... must be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure.” MPEP 2143, citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Terashima nor van de Ven suggest the claimed invention. However, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the present invention, claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 14 have been amended to clarify the invention.

[0005] The examiner asserts “van de Ven teaches and a method and system wherein both compressed and non-compressed data types are transmitted over each a plurality of transmission paths (see lines 15-20 of column 4).” *See* last Office Action page 3. Applicant respectfully submits that while van de Ven does teach “said uncompressed and said compressed values are transmitted or stored on n-1 channels,” the channels disclosed by van de Ven are *all* used to simultaneously transmit *either* compressed values *or* uncompressed values. The channels are not used to transmit *both* uncompressed values and compressed values *simultaneously*. This is taught by van de Ven in column 8 lines 24-36:

In addition to compressing the higher order numbers into a number suitable for transmission on an 8-bit data channel 14, the data channel 14 also carries an identifier in this preferred form such that the identifier indicates whether the data stream is an uncompressed number with the higher order 0 bits omitted *or*, a compressed number that requires subsequent decoding. On that basis, in this preferred example, one of the 8-bit data channels output from the Eprom 11 is used as the indicator so that only the remaining seven data bits are used for actual transmission of the data values themselves whether they be compressed *or* uncompressed. Italics added.

[0006] An identifier is taught that “indicates whether the data stream is an *uncompressed* number ... *or*, a *compressed* number...” See van de Ven column 8 lines 26-27. Seven one-bit channels carry the data stream described by van de Ven and an eighth channel carries the one-bit

identifier. This accounts for all eight channels taught by van de Ven. Therefore, all channels are consumed in transmitting *either* a compressed number *or* an uncompressed number. The channels are not able to transmit both a compressed number and uncompressed number simultaneously. In fact, the identifier is used to indicate whether the number is a compressed number *or* an uncompressed number.

[0007] van de Ven repeats the teaching of sending data on a portion of the channels and an indicator on the remaining channels in lines 65-67 of column 8, lines 1-15 of column 9, and lines 21-25 of column 9. Furthermore, van de Ven transmits a single data stream spread out among seven channels with an eighth channel used as an indicator. The seven channels are not used to send a plurality of distinct streams of data; rather, they are used in a coordinated fashion to transmit a single distinct stream of data. Specifically, each of the seven channels transmits one bit of a seven-bit data entity. All seven channels are employed to send a single seven-bit data entity simultaneously. The eighth bit indicates whether the seven-bin data entity is compressed or uncompressed.

[0008] In contrast, the presently claimed invention teaches “transmitting distinct streams of data of both the compressed and non-compressed data types over *each* of a plurality of transmission paths.” *See* amended claim 1. The claimed invention uses a *single* transmission path to transmit a distinct stream of data. The distinct stream of data does not require more than one transmission path. The claimed invention relies on a plurality of transmission paths to transmit a *plurality of distinct streams of data*, each of which may be compressed or uncompressed.

[0009] As described above, van de Ven does not teach or disclose transmitting a distinct stream of data on *each* of a plurality of transmission paths. Instead van de Ven teaches requiring a plurality of transmission paths to transmit a *single* distinct stream of data. Furthermore, van de Ven teaches *sequential* transmissions of varying data types (compressed or uncompressed) and is unable to transmit both compressed and uncompressed streams of data simultaneously.

[0010] The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the combination of the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142. For the reasons stated above, the Applicants assert that the combination of Terashima and van de Ven does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention and cannot therefore render the claims of the present invention obvious. Specifically, the combination of Terashima and van de Ven does not teach “transmitting *distinct streams of data* of both the compressed and non-compressed data types over *each* of a plurality of transmission paths.” *See* amended claim 1. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4, 14-19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

[0011] Additionally, the Applicants respectfully re-iterate that neither Terashima nor van de Ven suggest the claimed invention. However, in an effort to expedite the prosecution of the present invention, claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 13, and 14 have been amended to clarify the invention.

[0012] The Examiner rejected claims 5-7, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima in view of van de Ven and in further view of Notredame. The Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Terashima in view of van de Ven and in further view of Har. The examiner rejected claims 10-

13 and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Terashima in view of van de Ven, Har, and Notredame. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

[0013] All of these rejections rely on the combination of Terashima and van de Ven to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the present invention. As described above, the Applicants respectfully assert that the combination of Terashima and van de Ven does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Specifically, the combination does not teach “transmitting *distinct streams of data* of both the compressed and non-compressed data types over *each* of a plurality of transmission paths.” *See* amended claim 1.

[0014] To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the combination of the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142. For the reasons stated above, the Applicants assert that the combination of Terashima and van de Ven does not teach each and every element of the claimed invention and cannot therefore do not render the claims of the present invention obvious. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 5-13, 20-22, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

[0015] In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. In the event any questions or issues remain that can be resolved with a phone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: July 12, 2004

10 West 100 South
Suite 450
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 322-1054